



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,042	04/12/2007	Tobias Rasmussen	05822.0420USWO	5325
23552	7590	03/10/2010	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD PC			CHEN, JOSE V	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			3637	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/10/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/578,042	Applicant(s) RASMUSSON ET AL.
	Examiner José V. Chen	Art Unit 3637

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2010.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 21-32 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 21-32 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement (PTO-1448)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/03/10

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Clarification is needed for the following. In the remarks section of the papers filed 02/22/10, it is stated that "Claims 21-32 are pending". However, only claims 21-25 are included in the claims. Clarification and correction are required. For the purposes of examination, the application has been treated as if claims 21-32 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 21-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim(s) 21, 27 fail(s) to recite sufficient structural elements and interconnection of the elements to positively position and define: 1) how the transversal bars are movable on the long struts; 2) how the transversal bars are arranged movable and lockable; 3) what structures and relationship thereof allow for the unit load to be lifted from the fixture together with the loading ledges so that an integral structure able to function as claimed is recited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 21-32, **so far as definite**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harvey in view of Hodges, Maurer, and Cavalier et al. The patent to Harvey teaches structure substantially as claimed including a fixture having an approximate rectangular frame, formed of at least two parallel long struts (11) and at least two parallel short struts(12) at the ends of the long struts, transversal bars are arranged moveable on the long struts, with the ends of each bar on each long strut, a plurality of structure to engage a load, the only difference being that the structure to engage a load is not a plurality of cups and further including a loading ledge attached to the cups, one or more packages is received on the loading ledges to form the unit load and the unit load after forming is lifted from the fixture together with the load is not lifted from the fixture. However, the patent to Hodges (load engaging structure 30) teaches the use of providing cups (25 are receptacles receiving the load engaging structure 30), the load engaging structure including feet at 31 that engage the cups, the patent to Maurer teaches the load engaging structure to be an elongated ledge, and the patent to Cavalier et al teaches the use of providing a "package load" lifted off together.. It would have been obvious and well within the level of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention was made to modify the structure of Harvey to include adjustable cups and load engaging structure in the form of shortened ledges and to form such ledges as an elongated ledge structure, as taught by Mauer, and such load structure lifted off as a unit, as taught by Cavalier et al since such structures are conventional alternative structures used in the same intended purpose, and would have been a reasonably predictable result thereby providing structure as claimed. The method would have been obvious in view of the structures.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 02/22/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is noted that language obviating the 112 rejection would receive favorable consideration.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The reference to Olsen teaches structure similar to applicant's.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to José V. Chen whose telephone number is (571)272-6865. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f,m-th 5:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darnell Jayne can be reached on (571)272-7723. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

José V. Chen
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3637

/José V. Chen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3637